UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,375	12/01/2005	Dae-Jin Kim	764-31	2142
Dilworth & Barrese 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Uniondale, NY 11553			EXAMINER	
			BUIE, NICOLE M	
Uniondale, N Y	11555		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/521,375	KIM ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	NICOLE M. BUIE	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL! - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	12 January 2005						
·= · · · _	This action is non-final.						
,		ters prosecution as to th	e merits is				
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
·	ndor Ex parto Quayro, 1000 O.L	2. 11, 100 O.G. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the applic	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	· ·	., ,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	projan priority under 25 H.S.C.	S 110(a) (d) or (f)					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	oreign priority under 30 0.3.0.	3 119(a)-(d) of (1).					
<i>,</i> — <i>,</i> — <i>,</i> —	imenta have been received						
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
			1.04				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•	i received in this National	i Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, drawn to acrylic bead.

Group II, claim(s) 2-4, drawn to method for preparing acrylic polymer beads.

Group III, claim(s) 5-14, drawn to an acrylic sol composition.

The inventions listed as Groups I, II, and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: while an acrylic polymer bead having an average particle diameter of 0.2 to 0.5 µm, a standard deviation of particle diameter of 1 to 20% with respect to the average particle diameter as measured with a submicron particle sizer in an emulsion obtained by emulsion polymerization, and the final average particle diameter of 10 to 100 µm is shown between all three groups, it doesn't offer contribution over the prior art, because said polymer bead is disclosed in Overend et al. (WO 98/29507) (P4/L32-34, P5/L24-26).

Art Unit: 1796

A telephone call was made to George Kaplan (Reg. # 28,375) on 09/03/2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICOLE M. BUIE whose telephone number is (571)270-3879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571)272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,375 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 13-Sep-08 /N. M. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 1796 9/10/2008